

**Comment on the proposed conservation of usage of *Oceania* Péron & Lesueur, 1810 (Cnidaria, Hydrozoa) by the designation of *Oceania armata* Kölliker, 1853 as the type species**

(Case 3304; see BZN 62: 221–225)

M.A. Alonso-Zarazaga

*Departamento de Biodiversidad y Biología Evolutiva, Museo Nacional de Ciencias Naturales (CSIC), José Gutiérrez Abascal, 2, E-28006 Madrid, Spain*  
(e-mail: zarazaga@mncn.csic.es)

The authors of this case incorrectly spelled the name of the family based on *Oceania* Péron & Lesueur throughout the text. The stem of the generic name to which the ending –IDAE must be attached is to be determined according to Article 29.3.1. For the genus *Oceania*, it is *Oceani-*, by elimination of the Latin first declension nominative ending –a. Thus, the correct family name obtained is OCEANIIDAE, and not ‘Oceanidae’ as used, even if the latter was the original spelling used by Eschscholtz (1829). I propose that the application is amplified as follows:

- (4) to place on the Official List of Family-Group Names in Zoology the name OCEANIIDAE Eschscholtz, 1829 (type genus: *Oceania* Péron & Lesueur, 1810) (a valid emendation of the incorrect original spelling OCEANIDAE);
- (5) to place on the Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Family-Group Names in Zoology the name OCEANIDAE Eschscholtz, 1829 (an incorrect original spelling of OCEANIIDAE).

**Comment on the proposed conservation of the specific name of *Helix papillaris* Müller, 1774 (currently *Papillifera papillaris*; Mollusca, Gastropoda)**

(Case 3319; see BZN 62: 130–133; 63: 46–47)

Dietrich Kadolsky

*66 Heathhurst Road, Sanderstead, Surrey CR2 0BA, U.K.*

1. I support the reasoning and the resulting proposals made by Giusti & Manganelli. They serve the stability of nomenclature as well as honour the content of the original publications of *Turbo bidens* Linnaeus, 1758 and *Helix papillaris* Müller, 1774. If the content of the original publication of the name *Turbo bidens* Linnaeus, 1758 is taken on its own merits, the conclusion that this nominal species is not the same as *Helix papillaris* Müller, 1774 is straightforward. The identification of *Turbo bidens* Linnaeus with the latter is only based on the subsequent statements by Linnaeus (1767) and Schröter (1784), which still have an effect more than 220 years later. Up to the present day both names have been treated as the valid name for the same species; a literature survey suggests that the name *papillaris* has been treated as valid more often than *bidens* in the last 50 years (list held by the Commission Secretariat). Only if the experts could agree that the name *Turbo bidens* Linnaeus, 1758 is unidentifiable and should remain so, then an application on this subject would have been unnecessary.

2. In his comments to support the acceptance of the name *Turbo bidens* Linnaeus, 1758 for the species in question, Welter-Schultes (BZN 63: 46–47) makes a number of assumptions which are either poorly supported by facts, or are purely speculative:

(a) Müller's diagnosis (in contrast to Giusti & Manganelli's initial statement) was not clear enough – Müller's description and the figures cited by him leave no doubt as to the species intended; the use of the name *papillaris* in subsequent literature is unequivocal. The purpose of Giusti & Manganelli's proposal of a neotype is not to remove doubt as to the identification of *Helix papillaris* Müller, but to fix that name to a particular strain in the species complex.

(b) Rossmässler's (1835) dictionary of Latin descriptive terms cannot be applied to the earlier text of Linnaeus, 1758 – Possibly true, but this does not support the assertion that Linnaeus, 1758 described the same species as Müller. The latter clearly described in Latin the conspicuous colour pattern which is missing in Linnaeus's diagnosis.

(c) Linnaeus may have had 'good reasons' not to mention this colour pattern – It is inconceivable that the founder of systematics of the entire Plant and Animal Kingdoms would have suppressed mentioning a conspicuous character in his diagnoses, which is alluded to by later authors in both the genus and species name of the taxon here discussed.

(d) Linnaeus may have had only dead shells at his disposal – Unproven speculation. His words: 'testa . . . pellucida' (shell transparent) is unlikely to apply to dead (and hence bleached and opaque) shells. I would speculate that a scientist of Linnaeus's experience would have refrained from basing a new species on weathered shells.

(e) Linnaeus may have had several species in the family CLAUSILIIDAE in mind, of which only one (*viz. Papillifera papillaris*) showed the aforementioned colour pattern, which was therefore not considered diagnostic for the composite nominal taxon *Turbo bidens* – It is quite possible that Linnaeus united several species under that name, but this cannot be proven. I would expect that Linnaeus would not have regarded a clausiliid with a conspicuous colour pattern as conspecific with other clausiliids which lacked this feature.

### **Comment on the proposed conservation of *Palamopus* E. Hitchcock, 1845 (Ichnotaxa, Reptilia?)**

(Case 3348; see BZN 62: 237–239; 63: 49–50)

Markus Moser

*Staatliches Museum für Naturkunde Stuttgart Museum am Lowentor Rosenstein 1, Stuttgart, D-70191 Germany* (e-mail: moser.smns@naturkundemuseum-bw.de)

1. The term 'Sauroidichnites' was coined by Edward Hitchcock in 1837 as a subdivision of the general term 'Ichnites', and immediately afterwards used as a suborder of the order 'Dipodichnites' in the class 'Ichnolithes' (Hitchcock, 1841, 1844), thus in the first place 'Sauroidichnites' must be regarded as a suprafamilial taxon. Haubold (1971, 1974) pointed out that only in 1845 did Hitchcock begin to use generic names (i.e. different from higher level terms). Indeed, Hitchcock (1848,